

Appl. No. 09/871,329

R E M A R K S

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Claims 3-17 stand as originally presented.

Claims 1-17 were considered in the Office Action.

5 Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kang, U.S. Patent 6,434,696.

The Applicants believe that the currently pending claims are not anticipated by or obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth below, and respectfully request reconsideration.

Claim 1

The cited references do not disclose or suggest:

"A method of booting a computer, comprising:

testing for an intrusion into a first hardware component;

15 and,

configuring said first hardware component from a stored profile **if an intrusion was not detected.**"

(Claim 1, as amended, emphasis added)

The above highlighted features are not anticipated by the cited references and would not have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art having the cited references. For example, Kang does not disclose or suggest detecting intrusion into a hardware component. As indicated by the Examiner, Kang detects whether the CONFIG.SYS or AUTOEXEC.BAT files have been altered (see Kang, col. 5, lines 54-62), and if so, the contents of those files are processed. This does not disclose or suggest testing for an intrusion into a hardware component. To anticipate a claim for a patent, a single prior source must contain all its essential elements.

Appl. No. 09/871,329

Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc., 231 USPQ 81,
90 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The Applicants believe that claim 1 is allowable over the
cited references and respectfully request reconsideration.

5 Dependent claims 2-4 depend ultimately upon independent
claim 1 which is allowable over the cited art as discussed
above. These dependent claims are likewise in condition for
allowance at least because they depend on an allowable
independent claim. However, dependent claims 2-4 are
10 independently allowable at least in that they recite
particular features which, when combined with the elements of
the independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested in the
cited references.

Claim 5

15 The cited references do not disclose or suggest:

"A method of booting a computer, comprising:

storing a profile for each of a plurality of components;

detecting an intrusion into at least one of said
plurality of components;

20 **discovering characteristics about said at least one of
said plurality of components."**

(Claim 5, emphasis added)

The above highlighted features are not anticipated by the
cited references and would not have been obvious to a person
25 with ordinary skill in the art having the cited references.
For example, Kang does not disclose or suggest storing a
profile for each of a plurality of components. Kang discloses
saving the "boot configuration information" for future boots,
and rerunning the "normal boot process" only if the CONFIG.SYS
30 and AUTOEXEC.BAT files are modified. (See Kang, col. 4, lines

Appl. No. 09/871,329

1-22) Kang therefore stores a single profile, not "a profile for each of a plurality of components." Furthermore, Kang does not disclose "discovering characteristics about said at least one of said plurality of components". If a change to the CONFIG.SYS and AUTOEXEC.BAT files is detected as the "intrusion", then the characteristics discovered must be "about" the CONFIG.SYS and AUTOEXEC.BAT files. In fact, Kang does not discover characteristics about the CONFIG.SYS and AUTOEXEC.BAT files, it merely processes the instructions contained therein during the normal boot process.

The Applicants believe that claim 5 is allowable over the cited references and respectfully request reconsideration.

Dependent claims 6-8 depend ultimately upon independent claim 1 which is allowable over the cited art as discussed above. These dependent claims are likewise in condition for allowance at least because they depend on an allowable independent claim. However, dependent claims 6-8 are independently allowable at least in that they recite particular features which, when combined with the elements of the independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

Claim 9

The cited references do not disclose or suggest:

"A computer system, comprising:

a chassis intrusion detection system; and,

a state machine that configures a component of said computer system from a stored profile of said component if said chassis intrusion detection system indicates that said component has not been altered and configures said component from information discovered about said component if said

Appl. No. 09/871,329

chassis intrusion detection system indicates that said component may have been altered."

(Claim 9, emphasis added)

5 The above highlighted features are not anticipated by the cited references and would not have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art having the cited references. For example, Kang does not disclose or suggest a chassis intrusion detection system. The Applicants respectfully disagree that a chassis is equivalent to a "system" as in
10 Kang's computer system, and in particular, Applicants disagree that Kang's detection of changes in a computer file disclose a chassis intrusion detection system. The term "chassis" is defined by www.webopedia.com as follows:

15 "Also called case, a metal frame that serves as the structural support for electronic components. Every computer system requires at least one chassis to house the circuit boards and wiring. The chassis also contains slots for expansion boards. If you want to insert more
20 boards than there are slots, you will need an expansion chassis, which provides additional slots."

Clearly, Kang does not disclose or suggest a chassis intrusion detection system. Furthermore, Kang does not disclose a state machine. To anticipate a claim for a patent, a single prior source must contain all its essential elements.
25 Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc., supra.

The Applicants believe that claim 9 is allowable over the cited references and respectfully request reconsideration.

Dependent claims 10-13 depend ultimately upon independent claim 1 which is allowable over the cited art as discussed
30 above. These dependent claims are likewise in condition for allowance at least because they depend on an allowable independent claim. However, dependent claims 10-13 are

Appl. No. 09/871,329

independently allowable at least in that they recite particular features which, when combined with the elements of the independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

5

Claim 14

The cited references do not disclose or suggest:

10

"A program storage medium readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for booting a computer, said method steps comprising:

reading an indicia that indicates whether a change may have been made to a component;

15

discovering information about said component if said indicia indicates a change may have been made to said component and **configuring said component based upon said discovered information;** and,

configuring said component based upon stored information if said indicia indicates a change has not been made to said component."

20

(Claim 14, emphasis added)

25

The above highlighted features are not anticipated by the cited references and would not have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art having the cited references. Again, Kang does not disclose or suggest discovering information about a component. Even if the term "component" is extended to read on Kang's CONFIG.SYS and AUTOEXEC.BAT files, Kang does not disclose or suggest discovering information about those files, as discussed above. Kang merely discloses processing instructions contained in those files during a normal boot process. Kang also does not disclose configuring the CONFIG.SYS and AUTOEXEC.BAT files.

30

Appl. No. 09/871,329

The Applicants believe that claim 14 is allowable over the cited references and respectfully request reconsideration.

Dependent claims 15-17 depend ultimately upon independent claim 1 which is allowable over the cited art as discussed above. These dependent claims are likewise in condition for allowance at least because they depend on an allowable independent claim. However, dependent claims 15-17 are independently allowable at least in that they recite particular features which, when combined with the elements of the independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

The Applicants believe that the currently pending claims are allowable over the cited references and respectfully request the timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Dated: 7/29/04

Respectfully submitted,
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

By:

Guy K. Clinger
Guy K. Clinger Esq.
Registration No. 42,422
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 298-9888
Fax: (303) 297-2266